# Plans for next weeks High mass data

Dominik Wrana

# Data sample

Gap data from runs: 292319,294607,294630,294773,294775,294777

Central triggers: 2 CEM0.5 & 2 CJET0.5

#### **Conditions:**

- clean calorimeter for  $|\eta| > x$ (x = 0.6, 1.1, 1.6, 2.1)
- crap events rejected Artur's neural net

# To do – energies

- 1. Check if triggers were working fine
- 2. Sum Et plots
- 3. MEt plots
- 4. Sum Et vs MEt 2D plots
- 5. Fit proper functions to sum Et plots (exponentials or power laws)
- 6. One big plot with all sum Et distributions
- 7. EM ratios for differents bands of sum Et
- 8. EM ratios distributions vs sum Et 2D plots
- 9. EM ratios mean values vs sum Et 2D plots

# Simulations? Mass plots?

#### To do 2 – XXX data

For 0 bias data (only ~ 300k events!):

- Low luminosity < 50 \* 10^30
- 0 or 1 vertex only (vertex multiplicity to be checked)
- Crap events cleanup

The same plots as for GXG data for comparision.

### To do 3 – shape, jets

#### For GXG data:

- Events shape variables:
  - 1. Circularity C for differents bands of sum Et
  - (0-4; 4-6; 6-9; 9-14; 14+ MeV)
  - 2. Thrust T for the same bands od sum Et
- Use jet algorithms midpoint or K\_T (implemented in stntuple?):
  - 3. Fractions of events with certain number of jets with Et > threshold vs sum Et in an event
  - 4. DBS (double bremsstrahlung) and DPS (double parton scattering) observations

#### To do 4 - tracks

#### For GXG data:

- range of  $|\eta| < 1.1$  or  $|\eta| < 0.6$
- fiducial box of Pt and  $|\eta|$  (to be checked)
- primary vertex? only above 4 tracks → construction of a homemade vertices
- using only beam constrained parameters
- tracks quality or better statistics?
- 1. Tracks multiplicity in a different ranges of sum Et
- 2. Tracks multiplicity mean values vs sum Et

Rather large tracks Pt due to quality cuts → not good particle identification?

Lambdas, K shorts?